10/2/71 All the only finished copy of AWIII I have is one you made for me from yours which, fortunately, you made a number of markings most of which I can make out (some I can't with magnification). Although I am on only the 7th page in reading and correcting it, having just finished the first part, I am stopping to tell you this is helpful. You caught a few things I hadn't, inc. typos. I've never had a chance to read it since I finished the rough draft.

What impels me to stop the reading at this point is the note you have at the top of this page, where I discuss the invocation of the contract provision that a federal agency empowered to investigate may use the materials, and I say, "therein is its authority?" I preferred not to [illegible] point, but I'm not reluctant to, and I think we should both have a better understanding of your note, which cites Hoover as I so often have to the effect that the FBI will continue to investigate. Nobody ever asked Hoover if it was legal, what authority he had. He did have authority under the President's power, but that ended with the apt. On this day, when he became an adjunct of its, as he has set forth in a letter to it we both have. Rankin's response is without legal meaning or standing, is not even the man's non-binding opinion. Now it happens in this, what we are told is a society of laws, not of men, the government cant legally run around committing all sorts of investigations. They do. They are the luxuriest law-breakers in the land. But I am talking about legal authority. No federal crime was committed in Dallas. Therefore, no federal right to investigate. Now if we assume as you do, that Hoover's statement that he would continue to investigate clothes the FBI with the legal right, which I do not believe it does, he did not consider this stuff, the FBI did not, the government did not say how it was done for him, and it wasn't. Nor was it done as part of an investigation. Perhaps I should have made the point here, as I think I did later, that Clark blew the thing by saying that the purpose of the convoking of that panel was to "make a record". That is not provided for by the contract, which, theoretically, has its own record, Appendix A.B. Making a record is not an official investigation. I was then concentrating on the autopsy fact and it would have made no difference in court if the lawyers had done their work and spotted this. But I am persuaded that the entire Clark panels business, in terms of the contract, was illegal. Both panels, Yet this provision of the contract is the only one cited as authority for the panels and its work. Perhaps I should have made more of it here. In any event, since you challenge me on fact, I ask you for something more that what I unhumbly will not accept, Hoover's. Where did Clark get the legal authority to conduct any investigation of which this was or could be interpreted to be part? M

Js-thought you might be interested in what may seem like fairies and needles stuff but I think is not. Not that it makes any difference, because government does what it will anyway. Even on this subject they do what they ~~xxxx~~ want to and to hell with the law.